

Orange County Public Schools

Pinewood Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Pinewood Elementary

3005 N APOPKA VINELAND RD, Orlando, FL 32818

<https://pinewoodes.ocps.net/>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Frett Bowie, Rozene	Principal	The Principal serves as an instructional leader at Pinewood Elementary. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decision-making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II as well as Tier III. The Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Leighvard, Autherene	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal serves with the Principal as an instructional leader at Pinewood. She assists and observes teachers with data-based decision-making skills to ensure all students are meeting or exceeding expectations. She meets with teachers to discuss progress monitoring of students in Tier II as well as Tier III. The Assistant Principal also supports teachers with changing/enhancing instructional strategies based on data to meet the needs of each student.
Underwood, Heather	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The Curriculum Resource Teacher provides and leads professional development for core curriculum areas. She identifies systematic patterns of student and teacher needs and coaches teachers on instructional best practices. The CRT participates in data collection, progress monitoring, as well as data meetings to monitor student assessment results. The CRT works closely with the MTSS Coordinator to ensure teachers follow the MTSS procedures to meet the needs of our students.
Thrift, Michelle	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach provides guidance on the K-5 ELA and Social Studies plan components, supports teachers all aspects of instruction, coaches teachers daily, and facilitates data collection for grades K-5. In addition, the Instructional Coach conducts professional development with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized throughout the day. The Instructional Coach focuses guidance to 3-5 teachers in the area of ELA and Mathematics.
Beckett, Kimberli	Science Coach	The Science Coach provides guidance on the NGSSS Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and supports teachers with science planning for instruction. She coaches teachers daily and facilitates professional learning communities with teams. She conducts professional development in areas of Science. Data analysis is used to provide schedules for Tier 1 interventionists to support students in Science. She provides activities and administers Tier III instruction to groups of students identified with these specific needs.
Rotella, Dena	Reading Coach	The Reading/Math Coach provides guidance on the K-2 ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies plan components, supports teachers all aspects of instruction, coaches teachers daily, and facilitates data collection for grades K-2. In addition, the Reading/Math Coach conducts professional

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		development with the faculty to ensure that best practices in all areas of instruction are utilized throughout the day.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our School Advisory Council meets monthly to provide input on school improvement, family activity nights, and academics. We have members from the community, teachers, parents and staff as members of the council. Each year we elect new members from the current staff and community members to continue the work of the council.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored during data meetings using common assessment data. FAST PM1 and PM2 data will be monitored closely to ensure that the school improvement plan is working to meet the goals for Pinewood identified in the plan.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)*

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: D
	2018-19: D
	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	8	16	22	23	12	13	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	8	13	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	17	26	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	24	36	0	0	0	67	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	26	22	17	0	0	0	0	86	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	6	12	15	23	30	0	0	0	0	86

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	34	30	27	21	19	0	0	0	138	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	1	7	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	24	24	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	28	23	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	25	23	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	7	34	30	27	21	19	0	0	0	138	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	1	7	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	24	24	0	0	0	52	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	28	23	0	0	0	53	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	25	23	0	0	0	52

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	57	53	43	56	56	35		
ELA Learning Gains				53			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			55		
Math Achievement*	46	60	59	46	46	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				62			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			50		
Science Achievement*	44	63	54	38	61	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	59	59	39			56		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	234
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	364
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	4	Yes	4	4
ELL	35	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	48			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	3	3
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	47			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	43			46			44					53
SWD	9			0			0				4	
ELL	26			26			35				4	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			46			49				5	52
HSP	41			38							4	59
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	45			48			46				5	50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	43	53	38	46	62	45	38					39
SWD	5	29	33	13	39	31	10					
ELL	29	34	27	31	59	40	28					39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	55	38	47	64	50	37					46
HSP	31	38		34	52		31					32
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	42	56	41	46	64	48	36					40

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	35	45	55	37	40	50	37					56
SWD	9	56		6	56							
ELL	30	30		33	39		27					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	49	63	35	46	58	38					76
HSP	26	22		36	22		28					38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	36	46	58	36	42	50	38					60

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	54%	-15%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	52%	-3%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	59%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	62%	-18%	61%	-17%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	55%	-7%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	51%	-8%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on the state testing, the lowest area of performance was in Science with 44% demonstrating proficiency. The schoolwide focus was on ELA and Math. The lowest performing area of the two was ELA. The school scored 46% on PM3. Contributing factors to science performance include:

- Year-long staffing challenges (substitute teacher in place for 1 of the 3 classes for the duration of the year).
- Reading challenges for students in the 5th grade.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Each data component increased from the previous school year. The smallest increase was in Math from 46% proficiency to 48% proficiency. Based on the data, there were several factors that contributed to this increase.

1. Lack of instructional consistency in 4th grade.
2. Students in 4th grade struggled in the area of number sense and operations with fractions and decimals.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The math proficiency score has a 9 percentage points difference that the state score. Pinewood is 49% and the state is 58%. Contributing factors include:

Teacher knowledge of benchmarks - even through PLCs there were still some clear deficits in terms of teacher knowledge and implementation of the math program. Another factor included the staffing challenges to provide consistent instruction of the benchmarks.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The most improved component is science where the increase was from 38% to 44% proficient. To mitigate against the staffing challenges, support was provided from the Math/Science coach to provide support in the classrooms by providing small group instruction to targeted groups.

Another improved component is ELA moving increasing 3 percentage points moving from 43% to 46%. This past year, there was a focus on small group instruction in reading. Identified as a RAISE school, we were supported by our state literacy director in ELA grade level meetings. Teachers received professional development in PLCs and actionable feedback as the school leadership team monitored all areas of ELA instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Areas of concern:

Attendance: 138 total students with attendance below 90%.

Academic performance: Students scoring a Level 1 on statewide assessment in ELA & Math.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Increase overall reading proficiency to 49% or higher.

Achieving 45% or higher learning gains in reading for our lowest 25% students.

Increase students academic performance through building positive school culture and relationships.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and Hispanic are identified due to a trend of students being flagged as an ESSA subgroup. Students with disabilities (8% in ELA), English Language Learners (22% in ELA, 24% in Math, and 20% in Science), and Hispanic (36% in ELA, 33% in Math, and 20% in Science) students. There has been a significant gap in their achievement as compared to other subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Using previous data Students with disabilities are performing below 41% (8% in ELA), English Language Learners (22% in ELA, 24% in Math, and 20% in Science), and Hispanic (36% in ELA, 33% in Math, and 20% in Science) This year, we expect that by using evidence-based strategies we will increase overall proficiency in reading for each subgroup to 41%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Each targeted subgroup will be tracked with benchmark unit assessment data, Exact Path data, as well as FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 data. As appropriate, SIPPS data will be used to monitor the progress of students in Tier 2 and 3. MTSS data will be reviewed and groups of students approaching proficiency will be monitored to ensure that timely intervention can occur. Teacher and student data chats are scheduled to keep all parties accountable for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rozene Frett Bowie (rozene.frettbowie@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Evidence-based interventions include:

1. ESE/ELL support from certified teachers
2. Small group differentiated instruction
3. Use of instructional technology
4. MTSS process
5. Data disaggregation with instructional adjustments
6. After-school Tutoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Support from ESE/ELL teachers and small group instruction will assist in filling academic gaps in knowledge. The teachers will be provided training on how to retrieve, analyze and disaggregate data to make instructional decisions to improve achievement. In small-group differentiated instruction, formative data will be used to identify areas of deficiency for targeted remediation through reteach opportunities and tutoring. Teachers will be provided professional development to ensure that data is analyzed and used properly. Students who participate in the tutoring program have demonstrated increases in student achievement based on most recent data from Benchmark unit assessments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers (K-5) will learn how to use the Reading Assessment Guide to build small groups and use data to keep groups fluid.

Person Responsible: Monica Culver (monica.culver@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 February 2024

Teachers will learn about an effective system for ELA center time and learn to use the scholastic book room.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thrift (michelle.thrift@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

Teachers will gain an understanding of their PM1, 2 and 3 data. Teachers will also learn what the overall school's data looks like and discuss a plan to make adjustments for improvements toward attaining the SIP goals.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thrift (michelle.thrift@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 December 2023 May 2024

Teachers will take a look at their class data, team data, and school-wide data to make sure it is aligning with the SIP and to determine if any modifications need to be made.

Person Responsible: Dena Rotella (dena.rotella@ocps.net)

By When: February 2024

Teachers will meet with grade-level coaches for this PD. Teachers will plan small group triage lessons and strategically plan one week of small group lessons using the Dashboard question stems.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thrift (michelle.thrift@ocps.net)

By When: January 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Pinewood Elementary will promote involvement for all students, to increase academic performance across all academic areas and decrease discipline incidents.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We expect to see a 10% decrease in discipline referral occurrences from 92 occurrences to 83 or fewer referrals.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Student Support and Behavior Leadership teams will monitor student discipline each month and 6 weeks, respectively. These teams will provide feedback to the school leadership team based on data analyzed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rozene Frett Bowie (rozene.frettbowie@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The strategies that we will use to support this area of focus include: Continuing the implementation of Conscious Discipline including parental engagement activities. These include the work of the school guidance counselor and social workers (itinerant and school-based), the Pinewood House System continued implementation, student data chats, and monitoring teachers' use of Life Skills Curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was specifically chosen to combat the challenges that face families in terms of collaboration in educating their child(ren). Conscious Discipline is the school-wide initiative for student behavior and building connections. The resources include staff at the school dedicated to engaging families to partner in the work of education as co-creators, supporters, encouragers, advocates and/or models. Additionally, the Pinewood House system encourages parental engagement and builds a community where students and their families are included and are part of a community of learners. The goal is to build the capabilities, connections, cognition and confidence of our families as they work together with the school to increase student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conscious Discipline will be used school-wide. Teachers will have a designated calm-down area for students. Teachers will incorporate Brain Smart starts into daily instruction. The Pinewood System will be used daily to reward students in areas of academics, positive behavior, and citizenship.

Person Responsible: Autherene Leighvard (autherene.leighvard@ocps.net)

By When: Quarterly house meetings to review House Characteristics with students. Students will be able to earn house points. Houses will be celebrated based on the points earned each week.

Characteristics of Resilience

Teachers will learn about the 14 characteristics of resilient students and what those characteristics look and sound like.

Teachers will be able to plan lessons for teaching students the characteristics of the month.

Person Responsible: Autherene Leighvard (autherene.leighvard@ocps.net)

By When: October 2023, weekly follow up on implementation via the administrator's classroom walk schedule.

Teachers will be provided information on why and how we can use the Conscious Discipline Brain State Model. Teachers will also be provided takeaways to use immediately in their classrooms for Safety, Connection, and Problem Solving.

Teachers will begin, or continue, implementing strategies in the Conscious Discipline framework throughout the school day. They will have the opportunity to plan specific times to teach the strategies in their daily practice.

Person Responsible: Autherene Leighvard (autherene.leighvard@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023 April 2024 Weekly follow up on implementation via the administrator's classroom walk schedule.

Regular meetings of the HOUSE committee, student behavior committee, School based threat assessment team and student support team. These groups will analyze student data and determine if various interventions are needed.

Person Responsible: Autherene Leighvard (autherene.leighvard@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly ongoing throughout the school year. Weekly follow up on implementation via the house points award.

Small chunks of information will be shared regarding Conscious Discipline in the weekly newsletter. This information is available to all staff and is packaged for easy implementation or to modify current practices.

Person Responsible: Autherene Leighvard (autherene.leighvard@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing weekly throughout the school year. Monitoring via weekly follow up on implementation via the administrator's classroom walk schedule.

Half day resiliency training from outside vendor.

Person Responsible: Rozene Frett Bowie (rozene.frettbowie@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 Spring 2024 Weekly follow-up in school newsletter. Monthly follow up via resiliency traits awards with students.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Data shows in ELA our 3rd grade students performed at 49% proficiency, 4th grade scored 47% proficiency and 5th grade scored 40% proficiency. There is need for our students in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade to score 50% or higher for proficiency at each grade level on FAST PM3.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By targeting benchmark- aligned instruction in ELA, we anticipate an increase of students' proficiency to 50% or higher.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The benchmark alignment of ELA instruction will be monitored through weekly team common planning and classroom walk-throughs to ensure what is planned transfers into the classroom. Unit common assessments will be used to determine how students are progressing toward the overall goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Thrift (michelle.thrift@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Whole group instruction will be benchmark-based and rigorous, meeting the grade-level expectations of the benchmarks. After receiving data from this whole group, students will be strategically selected for Tier 1 small-group instruction with a focus on grade-level texts. Coaches and teachers use Being a Reader for Tier 1 benchmark-aligned intervention. Finally, students who need further support in their reading instruction will work in small groups during intervention time with a focus on prerequisite skills needed to be successful during Tier 1.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Specifically targeting grade level text using a district approved small group intervention tool will help students to be exposed to grade level benchmarks in whole group and small group. With an increased focus on the alignment to the benchmarks, we anticipate seeing an increase in students' ELA proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will provide teachers with training in benchmark-aligned instruction to implement daily during whole group and small group instruction, We will also focus on ensuring benchmark-aligned learning tasks are

provided during small group instruction. Training will take place during PLCs and Professional Development Training.

Person Responsible: Rozene Frett Bowie (rozene.frettbowie@ocps.net)

By When: We will evaluate student academic performance through data analysis and ensure students are receiving bench mark aligned instruction. These meetings will take place every 4-6 weeks.

Small Group Resources and Expectations

Teachers will learn about an effective system for ELA center time and learn to use the scholastic book room.

Person Responsible: Dena Rotella (dena.rotella@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023

PM1 Data Analysis and Overview

Teachers will gain an understanding of their PM1 - 3 data. Teachers will also learn what the overall school's data looks like and discuss a plan to make adjustments for improvements toward attaining the SIP goals.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thrift (michelle.thrift@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 December 2023 May 2024

SuccessMaker and Edmentum (Exact Path) - Instructional Technology

Teachers will take a look at their class data, team data, and school-wide data to make sure it is aligning with the SIP and to determine if any modifications need to be made. Teachers will be able to ask questions about their data. They will look at team data together to determine patterns and/or successes, and/or improvements that need to be made. We will look at the schoolwide data and follow the same structure.

Person Responsible: Michelle Thrift (michelle.thrift@ocps.net)

By When: February 2024

Being A Reader training - K-5.

Although implementation is K-3, teachers in all grades are provided with professional development in conducting small group instruction with the Being A Reader materials.

Person Responsible: Rozene Frett Bowie (rozene.frettbowie@ocps.net)

By When: August 2023 Monitoring in classroom walkthroughs focused on small group instruction.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Last school year, administrators looked at the needs of the staff based on school data. While content area support/training was provided through district professional developments, school officials wanted to provide training to teachers on establishing a culture of resiliency. Data from the student and families Panorama survey were analyzed and it was determined that in addition to the First Aid Youth Mental Health training teachers needed to hear from leaders in schools with similar demographics to Pinewood. Based on the data, students' Sense of Belonging category decreased by 6% on the 2023 survey administration. By the same token, the School Fit category decreased by 4% as reported by families of that same year. Based on this information Principal Frett Bowie collaborated with another OCPS school to bring Dr. James Moffet (consultant) to Pinewood's preplanning session to provide inspiration, resiliency training with practical strategies for teachers and administrators to help build resiliency in the upcoming year.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

By targeting benchmark- aligned instruction in ELA, we anticipate an increase of students' proficiency to 50% or higher. As we focus on benchmark-based instruction to increase overall K-2 proficiency school-wide in ELA, then we will increase student proficiency in 3rd grade and ensure alignment to the District Strategic Plan. Our instructional priority is to monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning. Based on STAR Reading (K-2), 48% scored a level 3 or higher and on the STAR Early Literacy assessment (K-2), 44% scored at level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

By targeting benchmark- aligned instruction in ELA, we anticipate an increase of student's proficiency to 50% or higher. Based on SY22 data, 33% of students in grades 3-5 scored at level 3 or higher on the state assessment, whereas the state average is 54%.

As we focus on benchmark-based instruction to increase overall grades 3 - 5 proficiency school-wide in ELA, and ensure alignment to the District Strategic Plan. Our instructional priority is to monitor student understanding and provide corrective feedback aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Based on K-2 FAST ELA Reading Assessment - Star Reading - Spring 2023 Results:
Kindergarten (Early Literacy) - 44% Level 3+

Grade 1 - 43% Level 3+
Grade 2 - 49% Level 3+

Spring 2024 expected achievement scores:
Kindergarten 50% Level 3+
Grade 1 - 50% Level 3 +
Grade 2 - 50% Level 3+

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the FAST Grade 3 ELA Reading PM3 - Level 3+:
Grade 3 - 49%
Grade 4 - 47%
Grade 5 - 39%

2024 PM3 expected achievement scores:
Grade 3 - 50%
Grade 4 - 51%
Grade 5 - 49%

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This area of focus will be monitored through the following:

1. Classroom observations, lesson plan reviews, and student data analysis (Benchmark assessments, instructional technology, etc.)
2. Professional development (monitoring for transference).
3. Professional Learning Communities where teachers will analyze data, engage in purposeful preparation for instruction to include differentiation, and analysis of assessment items and results.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Frett, Rozene, rozene.frett@ocps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Strategies that we will implement include increasing the rigor of standards-based instruction through engagement and processing strategies, structured team planning, and using assessments to drive instruction. We will use formative assessment data to monitor the effectiveness of the selected strategies. In addition, coaches will be present during team planning sessions to monitor the development of best practices that align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All standards-based lessons begin with a well-developed plan. Through team planning, teachers' capacity will increase through collaboration and the support of instructional leaders. After the planning process, teachers will implement the standards-based instruction. We will then determine if our standards-based instruction is working by examining formative assessment data.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
We will use the FAST data, DIBELS, and the SIPPS program to identify students' needs. Updated training and monitoring will be provided at the beginning of the year for all teachers.	Culver, Monica, monica.culver@ocps.net
We will provide tutoring with a focus on acceleration. This will be in addition to the extra hour of ELA instruction.	Underwood, Heather, heather.underwood@ocps.net
We will continue structured PLCs where we focus on backward-design planning, including small group instruction, scaffolded questioning, and data analysis.	Frett, Rozene, rozene.frett@ocps.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan is disseminated on the school website: <https://pinewoodes.ocps.net/>. In addition, the school improvement plan is also reviewed at School Advisory Council meetings which all stakeholders are invited to attend. Finally, School Improvement goals are reiterated during PLC and staff meetings and any content night where parents are invited to participate.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school builds a positive relationship with parents, families and other community stakeholders by posting the Family Engagement Plan on the school website: pinewoodes.ocps.net. Additional connections are created by inviting members of all groups to engage with the school through the School Advisory Council, volunteering opportunities, and content area events where families can learn to support their children. Partners in Education are welcomed and connected to the school and receive a House assignment as part of the School-wide House System. Community and parent volunteers are recognized at various celebratory events throughout the year.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Pinewood Elementary plans to strengthen the academic program in the school by engaging in purposeful planning and collaboration during weekly Professional Learning Community Meetings. Instructional time is protected time to where their interruptions are kept to a minimum. Various student support groups work to engage our families and improve attendance and punctuality to school as well as decrease students' time out of class for behavioral support. This includes the work of the school counselor, dean, and school-based leadership team by encouraging and recognizing positive behaviors, classroom supports and family connections.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

ESSA funds are used to provide planning days for teachers and to purchase the Tier 1 Interventionist positions.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No